

The Revolution.

ELIZABETH CADY STANTON, } Editors.
PARKER PILLSBURY, }
SUSAN B. ANTHONY, Proprietor.

NEW YORK, MAY 14, 1868.

TO OUR RADICAL FRIENDS.

We occasionally receive letters from Republicans and Abolitionists criticizing our affiliation with Democrats. They say, "Your paper is admirable, and if you would only 'drop Train' your subscribers would pour in by the hundreds, and all your old friends would rally round you and make your paper a complete success."

Although our paper is already a success, and subscribers do pour in by the hundreds from East, West, North and South, we will concede to all such friends and advisers the right to criticize when they so broaden their platform and policy as to make the claim of the educated women of the North for the right of Suffrage as important as that of the ignorant black men of the South, and when they place at our disposal a larger fund than liberal democrats have already done to help us to make "THE REVOLUTION" what we intend it shall be, the most liberal reform paper of the age. Before advising us to throw aside the generous services of our new found friends, look at the position of the Woman's Rights cause in this country before the Kansas election. Republicans and abolitionists alike ignored the question, claiming that this was "the negro's hour." Even Wendell Phillips told us before all Israel and the sun, on our own platform, that fashion was more to woman than the right of suffrage, after clearly showing the day before, on the anti-slavery platform, that without the ballot a man was but a slave. Republicans ignored us because they feared Woman's Suffrage was more than their party could carry; and abolitionists because they feared it would lessen the black man's chance of enfranchisement to make any demand for the woman by his side.

Our three most radical papers—the *Tribune*, the *Independent*, and the *Standard*—were closed against us. We could not get an article in either, pointing out the danger of reconstruction on the old basis of caste and demanding the recognition of woman in the new government. While they all made a merit of considering what was done on this question the world over, they postponed the recognition of the principle to the indefinite future. Their position to our cause was precisely that of the early colonizationists to negro emancipation. Thus ostracised, we tried to establish a paper of our own. Lucy Stone made appeals in person and by letter to leading republicans and abolitionists, but with her utmost efforts even she could not get pledges to the amount of \$10,000, though it was understood that she would edit the paper herself, wholly unencumbered by any George Francis Train or other Democratic bugbear.

New York and Kansas at this same time proposed to amend their constitutions. Not a Republican or Abolitionist would speak for us before the Constitutional Convention of New York nor go to Kansas in that important campaign; and the Hovey-Committee, of which Wen-

dell Phillips is chairman, in Boston, thought it appropriated \$1,000 to Parker Pillsbury to lecture on impartial Suffrage, passed a resolution confining his labors to New England, thus preventing him from going to Kansas, where the only practical work was to be done.

Of all our old associates George W. Curtis was the only champion we had in the New York Convention. Republicans and abolitionists were alike determined that woman's claim should be held in abeyance to that of the negro. And so enslaved and darkened is woman herself by centuries of degradation, that when the women of this nation should have risen up with one mind and denounced the exalting of brute force above moral power, some of the leading women, in consenting to this republican policy, would have committed the wholesale suicide of their own sex, had it not been for the unwavering determination of a few to be heard. Seeing the danger on all sides of the nation crystallizing again on the old principle of caste, with an aristocracy of sex, the most narrow, hateful, and dangerous on which a government was ever based—seeing that the women of virtue, wealth and character in this country were to be made the subjects of every vicious, ignorant, degraded type of manhood, we unfurled the new banner to the breeze, "immediate and unconditional enfranchisement for the women of the republic." Democrats saw the logic of our position, and echoed it. They presented our petitions when republicans laughed them to scorn, and plead our cause in the State and national councils, and franked our documents from one end of the Union to the other. The women of St. Louis sent George Francis Train to Kansas, because neither Horace Greeley, Theodore Tilton or Wendell Phillips proposed to go. He labored there faithfully for weeks, often speaking three times a day, and the result of the election was 9,000 votes for Woman's Suffrage. Some deny the credit of this vote to Mr. Train, but we were on the spot and saw the wonderful power he exerted over a class of voters whom none of our other speakers could reach. As soon as we stated to him the necessity of an organ for our thought, he pledged himself at once that the long-wished for "REVOLUTION" should no longer be postponed. He then travelled through nine States in the Union, announcing "THE REVOLUTION" in his speeches wherever he went, thus successfully heralding us before we were born.

Now, it seems to us, in the full tide of our success, quoted and recognized by the press on both Continents, that warnings and criticisms, or any patronizing professions of interest, come with rather a bad grace from those who have maintained a stolid silence on our question to this hour. It was the utter desertion of our cause by those to whom we had a right to look for aid, that forced us to our present affiliations.

So long as we are enabled to proclaim our principles, it matters not who helps to do it. We regard the enfranchisement of woman as the most important question of the age, and we are determined to keep it before the nation, and to this end we will accept aid from any quarter, affiliate with any man, black or white, Jew or Gentile, saint or sinner, democrat or republican. As the mass of our women are republicans and abolitionists, some may be used as a cat's-paw to pull the radical chestnuts out of the fire, and sacrifice themselves to false notions of magnanimity to others. All this hue and cry about Train is a mere cover, a sham. The real trouble is, he has made it possible for us

to utter the thoughts that radicals wish to hold in abeyance until the black man is safe beyond a peradventure, and Grant is enthroned in the White House.

Now if the democratic party were wise they would exalt the divine idea of equality uttered by the fathers in '76, and thus swallow up these blind politicians and partial reformers, and with the broader platform of "Universal Suffrage," and "Woman's Rights" inscribed on their banners, and an honest, sober man for their candidate, they would sweep the country from Maine to California in the coming election, and secure the peace and prosperity of the republic forever.

E. C. S.

E. PLURIBUS UNUM.

THE ANNIVERSARIES.

WHILE the different societies and sects assemble in the metropolis, each one to press its partial idea, each deeming its specialty the most important, in securing the general welfare of the race, let us consider the chain of causes that links all these reforms in religion, government and social life together; the broad principle that underlies all alike. If we examine the creeds of political organizations, church or reform associations, temperance, peace, prisons, the rights of black men, women or labor, we find the special pleadings on each and all these platforms resolve themselves at last into the right of individuals, to be guided in all things by their own reason and conscience; the right to life, liberty and happiness. The one question that uniformly thrusts itself for consideration on all these platforms, is whether it is better to sacrifice the few to the many or the many to the few, none seeming to comprehend that if we obey the laws of our being there need be no such thing as sacrifice at all, for in all cases the highest good of one is the highest good of all, and the highest good of all does not require the sacrifice of one individual right. If we listen to the debates in the prison and peace societies we readily see the injustice of stronger men and nations coercing the weaker to their will, of war and violence and retaliation in every form, the cruelty and vindictiveness of our whole criminal code, of the gallows, the chain, the dungeon, the cold shower, all those barbarisms of a darker age, and we feel it is our duty to protect the rights of every human being, from the millionaire in his palace to the beggar in the street, knowing that only in the safety of the humblest member can society be made secure. A wise selfishness would teach us to make the wrongs of all mankind our own, for the race are so bound together that we must rise or fall as one.

Again, on the temperance platform it is asked, shall we protect society against drunkenness, by prohibiting or licensing the traffic in intoxicating drinks, by placing the rumseller and the drunkard under the restraints of law and the ban of an indignant public sentiment, or shall we go deeper down, and having learned that in false marriage, false education, prolonged, monotonous, and half-paid labor, we have the causes of these morbid appetites, wisely set ourselves to work, and so change the conditions of the individual, as to secure a healthy, happy, harmonious development, and thus protect society by a recreation of the race. Everything short of this radical work, all attempts at a forcible repression of vice, disease and crime, will prove utterly abortive in the future as the past. Just in proportion as we exalt individua-